HIGHER EDUCATION

SEMIMONTHLY PUBLICATION OF THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY
Office of Education, Higher Education Division

VOL. VIII, NO. 6 WASHINGTON, D. C. NOVEMBER 15, 1951

Special Programs of the Office of Education

The Office of Education is conducting five special programs which are related in part to the current international situation. They are the Civilian Education Requirements Program, the Inventory of Physical Facilities and Human Resources in Colleges and Universities, the College Housing Loan Program, the National Scientific Register, and the educational exchanges with foreign countries. The greater part of this number of HIGHER EDUCATION is devoted to these programs.

LLOYD E. BLAUCH.

Civilian Education Requirements Program

A Statement to a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor

By EARL JAMES McGRATH*

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE:

I am Earl J. McGrath, Commissioner of Education. I am pleased to respond to the request of this subcommittee to appear today to discuss the inadequacy of the allotments of steel and other basic construction materials for educational purposes under the Controlled Materials Plan of the Defense Production Administration.

I want, at the start of this statement, to recognize the difficult problem confronting the National Production Authority and the Defense Production Administration. I do not presume to sit in judgment upon the decisions made by the NPA-DPA with respect to the equity of the allocations made. I can speak—and do—with reference to the inadequacy of the allotments made for education construction purposes.

I do this as Commissioner of Education, having been given certain responsibilities to safeguard the essential interests of the Nation in respect to its schools, colleges, and libraries during this period of international crisis. And I would be derelict in my duty if I did not make every possible effort to safeguard these interests.

*United States Commissioner of Education, Federal Security Agency. The subcommittee is investigating the allocation of materials in short supply to educational systems and institutions by the Defense Production Administration. The statement was submitted on October 16, 1951. As published here it has been slightly revised.

IN THIS ISSUE

	Page
Civilian Education Requirements	61
Inventory of Facilities and Resources	66
College Housing Loan Program	69
Cooperative Bureau for Teachers	71
National Scientific Register	72
Educational Exchanges	74
Survey of Architectural Profession	78
Iranian and Pakistan Studies at Columbia	78
Critical Materials for Education	79
New Publications	80

972201—51——1

Early Operation

For the purposes of the record I should like to sketch briefly something of the background of this matter. As you know the Federal Security Administrator is the official claimant before the Defense Production Administration for all matters relating to school and hospital construction and for supplies and equipment for health, education and welfare. In turn, the Administrator has delegated to the Office of Education the claimant functions in respect to schools, colleges, and libraries.

At the outset and prior to the institution of a controlled materials program, these functions were purely advisory. Our immediate task was to prepare for the NPA a comprehensive statement of program requirements in the entire field of education for the calendar years of 1951 and 1952. This survey was to serve as the basis for determining the amount of steel and other critical materials to be allotted for educational purposes under the proposed Controlled Materials Plan.

It was not until May 3, 1951, that the NPA began to issue permits for the commencement of construction. However, no permit was required on a project begun before May 3, and the same was true of all small projects requiring less than 25 tons of steel. During this preliminary period we spent a very considerable amount of time and energy giving spot assistance in hardship cases where there was difficulty in obtaining various items of needed equipment. From February through June we handled some 8,500 requests for such assistance, and in the majority of instances were successful in helping the applicants to get what they needed.

Function of the Office

The Controlled Materials Plan went into effect on July 7. Its purpose was to establish an equitable distribution of materials in short supply as between the military and civilian parts of our economy and as among the major segments of the civilian economy. Under the plan, the free market in steel, copper, and aluminum was practically abolished, and a policy was established of making quarterly allotments of these critical materials to the various segments of the Nation's economy—to both defense and nondefense operations.

Under Delegation 14, dated July 11, 1951, the National Production Authority made the Office of Education responsible for estimating the requirements, by quarters, for all controlled materials for educational purposes. The over-all quarterly allotments are determined by the DPA and constitute the bank of critical materials which we maintain. All applications for materials in short supply are filed with our Office. We issue the necessary allotments on the basis of relative urgency and charge them against the quarterly bank which the DPA has established.

I repeat, we spell out the quarterly requirements. The DPA then makes the quarterly allotments. We determine the relative needs of the applicants and make the specific allocations of materials within the limits set by DPA allotments. [1]

Inadequate Allotments to Education

For simplicity of discussion, from this point on I refer solely to the allotments of steel, with the understanding that comparable amounts of copper and aluminum are also involved. For the quarter beginning July 1, 1951, we submitted an estimate of basic requirements for all educational purposes of 192,000 tons. This was an estimate derived from the most careful analysis of school and college construction already under way and projects which were ready to begin construction during this quarter. The amount allotted to us was 100,000 tons or a little more than half of our stated requirements.

We were, of course, greatly concerned over this wide gap between our estimated program requirements and the allotments received. On the basis of actual construction applications later received, our estimates proved to be correct.

Our allotment for the third quarter of calendar 1951, short as it was compared to requirements, did not place even the allotted 100,000 tons of steel at the project sites. The gap between requirements and the amounts allotted became increasingly evident during the quarter. In the first place, many manufacturers had already committed their entire production capacity by the time the Office of Education had issued allotments since steel was still available in the free market up to October 1. The net result of this was to pile up requirements. The effect of delay and shortage in the third quarter allotment was to postpone construction, building up a cumulative deficiency for the fourth quarter of calendar 1951 and the first quarter of calendar 1952.

[1] There has been established in the Office of Education a Division of Civilian Education Requirements under the direction of Deputy Commissioner Rall I. Grigsby. Matters pertaining to construction, equipment, and supply needs involving critical materials for colleges, public and private elementary schools, secondary schools, and libraries are handled by this Division. (Editor)

The difficulty was further increased when the fourth quarter allotment was actually smaller than that for the third quarter. We submitted basic requirements totaling 196,000 tons. The allotment made was 94,000 tons. After vigorously appealing, we were able to secure a supplemental allotment of 10,000 tons, bringing the total up to 104,000 tons which was, as you see, still only slightly more than half the estimated requirements.

In making allocations for the fourth quarter, we were able to make provision for construction already under way (which was in pursuance of the stated policy of the NPA) and to authorize allocation of materials to 86 of the most urgent cases which constituted about 9 percent of the 1,001 applications for steel to start new construction.

The situation which I have described was bad. The situation which we are now facing threatens to be much worse. On Friday of last week, the Defense Production Administration announced that the education allotment for the first quarter of 1952 would be 96,000 tons, as against education requirements submitted last August totaling 192,000—later revised upwards to 255,000 tons largely because of the postponement of requested fourth quarter 1951 new construction. This current allotment represents less than 38 percent of estimated total requirements.

Results

I should like to point out that the first quarter of 1952 is particularly critical for school construction because postponement during the months of January to March will mean the loss not merely of those months, but of an entire school year. The buildings must go forward now if they are to be ready for occupancy in the fall of 1952. Deferral of new starts in the first quarter of 1952 means, in many cases, deferral of occupancy until the school year beginning September 1953.

With an allotment of only 96,000 tons, it seems likely that for the first quarter of 1952, we shall again be obliged to allocate practically all available steel for construction already under way. Only a comparatively few new projects can be given the green light, and the majority of those already deferred in previous quarters will have to be deferred once again. [2]

[2] As of October 1, 1951, 2,314 construction projects had been approved and materials had been allocated to support construction through the fourth quarter. As of that date there were pending 2,293 applications for authorization to commence construction. Since October 1 additional applications for authorization to commence construction have been received at the rate of about 75 a day. (Editor.)

This deferral of education construction is not in the national interest. This is not a judgment of educators alone. The President of the United States has repeatedly pointed to the need for maintaining the efficiency of the schools at a high level, both for reasons of military security and as essential to the preserving of our democratic institutions.

Mr. Truman has said: "Our public-school system faces the greatest crisis in its history. More than ever before, we need positive action by the Federal Government to help the States meet their educational tasks. We simply cannot afford to let overcrowding, or lack of equipment or staff impair the the basic education of our young people."

The Director of Defense Mobilization, Charles E. Wilson, in his first quarterly report to the President, on April 1, 1951, also emphasized that "we must maintain our basic standards of education and health, so as to develop our manpower resources over the long run."

To develop these manpower resources over the long run, we cannot continue to postpone schoolhouse construction. Our schools are still struggling desperately to recover from the effects of a 20-year lag in new school construction—a lag which had its origin in the depression of the 1930's and was further intensified by the shortage of labor and materials during World War II. To say that when the Nation's steel capacity catches up with the demand, we shall be able to resume our school construction is to miss the issue. The point is that the present generation of children must have a sound education now or not at all. You can't put children into educational cold storage "for the duration" and later put them in an educational hothouse.

Critical Situation in Communities

The situation is already critical to a very high degree. In far too many communities, classrooms are so overcrowded as to make effective teaching almost impossible. School basements, apartment-house basements, empty stores, garages, churches, and even trailers and tents are being utilized in an effort to take care of our children. In many instances school authorities are having to resort to half-day sessions and less to carry the load. Deferral of construction in the first quarter of 1952 will mean deferral for at least five quarters of the educational opportunity of the school children concerned.

In the meantime, the tidal wave of youngsters entering our schools bears down upon us. In Sep-

tember of this year the enrollment was some 800,000 greater than in the previous year. And at the beginning of next year's school term—September 1952—it is estimated that we shall have an additional 1,700,000 more children enrolled than in 1951.

Furthermore, the situation as it will develop over the next several years is equally grave. In each succeeding year in which school construction is deferred, the cumulative effect of expanding enrollments increases the difficulty. In other words, the *immediate* needs of our elementary schools are so pressing that even a 100 percent fulfillment of construction schedules would fall far short of providing an adequate number of classrooms.

Problem in Higher Education

For our colleges and universities, deferment of new construction will present a serious problem. In the decade that has elapsed since 1940, the last year of normal college attendance prior to World War II, college enrollment has increased 100 percent, but the physical facilities for instruction and residential housing have increased slightly less than 20 percent. Moreover, the facilities available in 1940 were, in general, inadequate to accommodate the number of students then enrolled.

The need to support construction already under way on college and university campuses has made heavy demands upon our slender supply of steel. For the most part we are dealing with comparatively large projects, such as necessary heating plants and research laboratories on which construction was already under way. Beyond this, there were a number of projects for dormitory housing to relieve the heavy pressures which many colleges and universities had been under for the past several years. These pressures still remain despite the small decrease in enrollments that followed this year's decline in the number of men entering college under the GI bill of rights. Under the NPA policy of giving first call on critical materials to projects already under way, it was necessary, during the third and fourth quarters, to allot as much as 30 percent of our bank of steel to these needs in the institutions of higher education.

I understand that the DPA proposes to establish a limitation for steel in the first quarter of 1952 upon the amount which may be used for construction at colleges and universities. Before such a limitation on university and college construction is imposed, it would be desirable to review carefully its impact on construction needed for defense research and training of scarce professional and scientific manpower. If the Nation allows its higher educational plant to fall into obsolescence, highly important technological skills upon which this country depends will be seriously impaired.

Priorities for Education Construction

With steel allotments falling so short of requirements we are under the necessity of applying the most rigid type of priority criteria, which are:

1. Continuation of authorized construction of projects needed for important national defense installations or because of clear and direct national defense relationship; e. g., elementary and secondary schools in areas certified as critical housing areas under the Defense Production Act, research laboratories in higher education institutions for atomic energy research projects.[3]

2. Authorization to commence construction in current or subsequent quarters of projects needed for important national defense installations or because of clear and direct national defense relationship; e. g. (same as No. 1).

3. Continuation of authorized construction of projects to replace elementary and secondary schools, colleges, and libraries destroyed by calamity; e. g., flood damage in Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma.[3]

4. Authorization to commence construction in current or subsequent quarters of projects to replace schools, colleges, and libraries destroyed by calamity; e. g. (same as No. 3).

5. Continuation of authorized construction of projects to relieve overcrowding, arranged approximately in order of degree of overcrowding; e. g., elementary or secondary schools in which children are on double session, or for which a court has ordered equalization of facilities, or to replace facilities condemned by competent authority as unsafe, or projects for which construction has been approved under Public Law 815 or 475.[3]

6. Continuation of authorized construction of projects to improve instruction and operation efficiency or to reduce the financial burden on the community; e. g. college science buildings, consolidated rural schools.[3]

[3] Projects in these categories, which are covered by rating issued on Form 13, represent a prior lien upon the critical materials allotted to the U. S. Office of Education for construction of schools, colleges, and libraries. Unless unforeseen emergencies should sharply reduce allotments, construction schedules already approved will be carried through to completion.

7. Authorization to commence construction in current or subsequent quarters of projects to relieve overcrowding, arranged approximately in order of degree of overcrowding; e. g. (same as No. 5).

8. Authorization to commence construction in current or subsequent quarters of projects to improve instruction and operation efficiency or to reduce the financial burden on the community; e. g. (same as No. 6).

Factors Involved

The fact of the matter is, however, that practically no application is received which does not represent a high degree of urgency. The overwhelming majority of new construction projects have already passed through a stringent screening by the schools and colleges themselves. School districts do not usually float bonds, and college authorities do not usually promote special financing of a new project until the need is fairly urgent.

With our elementary and secondary schools the need must first be established by the local school boards. Architects must be engaged, plans drawn up and submitted to a variety of individuals whose conflicting views on the matter must somehow be reconciled. Decisions on financing must be made by the legal taxing authorities in each local jurisdiction. To float a new bond issue it is usually necessary to await the next election. The public must be convinced of its necessity, otherwise the voters may turn it down. Sometimes it requires several attempts to get a sufficiently large affirmative vote. In the meantime, construction costs usually have to be refigured to meet rising material and labor costs. Sometimes a project may remain on the drawing board for 3 or 4 years before it finally goes into construction.

With our State colleges and universities the process is roughly the same. In this instance, however, appropriations depend upon action by State legislatures which in many States meet only once every 2 years. And it often takes two or three sessions before the necessary bill is passed. For private schools and colleges, financing is also usually the crucial point. A large-scale construction project usually requires a succession of special fund-raising drives among the alumni which may be spread over several years before the full amount is assured. It must be apparent, therefore, to any objective observer that these applications for construction materials represent a genuine need.

In the effort to conserve steel and to get the best use of such material as is available, we are working with the architects, contractors, and the school and college authorities to curtail the amount of steel specified for each individual project. By revising blueprints and substituting other noncritical materials, a very substantial amount of steel can be saved. Already we are seeing the results of this effort. The first applications we received indicated that schools were using about 300 tons of steel per million dollars of construction. Later this figure was reduced to 270 tons. Now it is running at approximately 200 tons.

Basic Considerations

In concluding my statement, I should like to comment briefly on some basic ideas which will, I hope, be weighed in the making of decisions regarding the immediate future of education in the Nation. We are entering what may prove to be the most critical period in our Nation's history. Without question, we and the other free nations of the world are facing an unparalleled threat to our liberties. Moreover, the present international emergency is likely to be with us for many years to come.

For the purely material needs of our long-term defense program, it is imperative that we maintain our schools and our colleges and universities at a maximum level of efficiency. The military and production strength of the Nation rests squarely on the flow of manpower into our labor market and armed services. This manpower to be effective must have the basic training and mental adaptability that only our schools can provide. Broadly speaking, a GI without such training is under a severe handicap in acquiring the specialized skills needed to make him a good soldier. And the same holds true for a worker in a highly mechanized defense plant.

Furthermore we are dependent upon our colleges and universities to give us the men trained in engineering, electronics, and the other sciences vital both to the conduct of the war and to defense production. We are weakening our defense program in its most critical area if we fail to recognize the importance of these factors.

But it is not enough that, with military strength, we assure the survival of the free world. Military strength is one essential but it is only one. Nonmilitary essentials cannot be regarded as postponable or expandible. Cultural, ideological, economic,

and moral weapons are just as important as military weapons in stemming Communist expansion.

Particularly to that generation of children now growing up in our midst, we have an overriding obligation. The right of every boy and girl to an education is one of the great heritages of our democratic tradition. We cannot short-change them on this heritage. Granted every possible consideration for military defense needs, we must hold constantly in mind that what we are defending is democracy and the essential freedoms of the individual. And only as our schools flourish can these freedoms be maintained.

The American people are profoundly disturbed over the condition of their schools. They are alarmed by the increasing gap between school enrollments and classroom facilities. The majority of them would agree that to defend democracy it is important to build tanks, guns, and planes, but it is equally important to build schoolhouses.

Inventory of Physical Facilities and Human Resources in Colleges and Universities

By ROBERT E. IFFERT*

FOR THE FIRST TIME in the history of higher education in the United States there is being assembled simultaneously information on the plant, program, and personnel of individual colleges and universities. The project is also unique in that it is designed to operate as a perpetual inventory. The extent to which this can be accomplished depends upon how well college and university officials understand the purposes of the inventory.

Origin of the Inventory

The prospects of an extended state of national emergency following the opening of hostilities in Korea prompted the Executive Office of the President, through the National Security Resources Board, to explore the possibility of having one central place to which colleges and universities could send reports describing facilities and resources that might be used in a national defense program. Numerous Government agencies attested to the need for current information on physical facilities and human resources for instruction and research, and for feeding, housing, health, and recreation facilities.

In August 1950, the National Security Resources Board, after consulting with representatives of the several constituent organizations interested in higher education, designated the Office of Education as the agency to receive pertinent information, analyze and classify it, and make it available on short notice to Federal agencies that need it. To this end the staff members of the Division of Higher Education set about the preparation of an outline that could be used by the colleges and universities in developing their reports. In the meantime, the Commissioner of Education, in a *Defense Information Bulletin*, had indicated what seemed to be the pertinent points that should be covered in the reports. The diversity of facilities and offerings in institutions of higher education made it necessary to prepare a form that would serve only as a general outline for a report. Each institution was expected to adapt the outline to the presentation of the most accurate picture of its facilities and resources.

Substance of the Inventory

The final form of the outline grew out of suggestions and criticisms from the Army, Navy, and Air Force of the Department of Defense, 11 civilian agencies of the Government each having substantial responsibility for defense activities, 9 associations and councils of colleges and universities with headquarters in Washington, and the American National Red Cross. The 11 civilian agencies of Government that cooperated are: Atomic Energy Commission, Bureau of the Budget, Central Intelligence Agency, Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, Department of the Interior, Department of Labor, Department of State, Library of Congress, National Security Resources Board, and Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency. Suggestions on the outline form were solicited and

*Specialist in higher education, Office of Education. Mr. Iffert has immediate responsibility for the direction of this project.

received from representatives of the American Association of Junior Colleges, American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education, Association of American Colleges, Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Division of Higher Education of the National Education Association, Lutheran Council on Higher Education, and the National Conference for Mobilization of Education.

In its final form the outline consists of the following parts: Part I—Physical Plant Devoted to Instructional Services; Part II—Special Programs of Teaching and Research; Part III—Human Resources of Institution; Part IV—Non-instructional Facilities Operated by the Institution; Part V—Proposals for Defense Uses of the Institution's Facilities; Part VI—Information About Community in Which Institution Is Located (to be supplied only if institution is in a center of population of less than 10,000).

Extent of Participation

The outlines were placed in the mails on December 29, 1950, and the first completed report was received on January 2, 1951. By the end of September a total of 1,204 reports had been received. This number represents more than 60 percent of the institutions listed in the *Education Directory, 1950–51, Part 3, Higher Education.* The combined enrollment in all of the reporting institutions is about 85 percent of that in all institutions. Eighteen States had at least 90 percent of their enrollment covered in their replies and only 14 States had less than 75 percent of their enrollment covered. There were 3 States with 100 percent coverage and only 1 with less than 50 percent.

The 539 publicly controlled institutions that have reported represent 73 percent of the colleges and universities in this group. A total of 52 percent of the privately controlled institutions have reported; 59 percent of those independent of a church, 52 percent of those that are church-related non-Catholic, and 40 percent of those controlled by the Roman Catholic Church reported. Fifty-four percent of the institutions classed as Negro have reported.

Status and Use of the Inventory

The information furnished by the colleges and universities in these reports is being analyzed and coded so that it will be possible, on short notice, to locate institutions having certain specifications with reference to instructional space, housing and feeding facilities, teaching and research staffs, and, to some extent, library and equipment facilities. An important outcome of the inventory is the derivation of certain relationships such as the number of square feet per student in housing facilities, the space per student being used for feeding facilities, the relationship of classroom to laboratory space by type of institution, to name only a few. Normative materials such as these should prove useful in self-appraisal studies as well as in surveys of institutions of higher education. Regional accrediting associations might also find the normative data very valuable.

In view of the frequent requests for information on available specialized personnel, considerable attention is being given to the coding of professions and vocations for which the institutions offer programs that qualify for employment. Similar attention is being given to the coding of specialized hidden abilities of staff members.

The information on Part I—Physical Plant Devoted to Instructional Services has been coded and punched on tabulating cards. Codes have been devised for all parts of the outline and approximately 75 percent of the coding has been completed.

Before the task of indexing and coding the reports was undertaken, conferences were held with representatives of various agencies of Government in an effort to get concrete suggestions on the types of information that might be required by these agencies. In general, the experience in these conferences indicated that it would be very difficult to arrive at a consensus in any agency with reference to the most important types of information that would be needed. It has become clear that the most detailed system of coding would probably still omit types of information that could conceivably be called for. Some of the agencies have already made requests for information in areas far afield from those discussed in the exploratory conferences. As a matter of fact, a very small percentage of the calls for information fall within what might be termed the expectancy area. These calls have come from 21 different units of the Federal Government.

Reference to a few requests will illustrate the types of service that can be rendered with the information now available. Among the first requests received was one from the Federal Civil Defense Administration for help in locating institutions that had certain plant facilities adequate to

meet the needs of an extensive outdoor training program. Geographical limitations and other provisions were set up so that the location of suitable sites was a difficult problem. Another request was received for assistance in the identification of a college or university that might serve as a sponsoring institution for a university in an area under military occupation. Numerous requests have been received for assistance in the location of persons with highly specialized knowledges and skills for service on a contract basis. The Library of Congress has requested a list of institutions that have certain specialized collections of books in their libraries. Eight different Government agencies are now using duplicate copies of individual institutional reports in connection with their planning and operational activities. The Directors of Civil Defense in four States have arranged through this office to obtain copies of the reports on facilities for the institutions of higher education in their respective States. There has been considerable reduction in the amount of correspondence necessary in connection with the Housing Loan and Controlled Materials programs because of the availability of information in the inventory files.

Potential Uses

There is a marked tendency on the part of contracting agencies of the Government to concentrate their attention on a relatively small number of educational institutions. This practice results in saturation of the facilities and resources in these institutions to a point of diminished usefulness and efficiency. It can be demonstrated that there are many institutions whose total resources may not equal those of institutions under contract but whose available resources are far superior to those being used. It is questionable whether it is in the best interest of higher education to encourage the practice of concentrating research and development programs in a few institutions. There is a tendency for these institutions to draw upon the facilities and personnel of other institutions for the period of the contract, thereby causing serious dislocations which may result in the ultimate weakening of the entire higher educational system. Responsible officials have recognized the problem and are seeking its solution. The information in the Inventory of Facilities files, if properly used, can make a significant contribution. If the international situation were to require a more complete mobilization of resources, the opportunities for participation by our colleges and universities would increase. The availability of information in a central point should facilitate the utilization of these resources in a much more orderly manner than would otherwise be possible.

The colleges and universities have been asked to keep the information in the inventory files up to date. This applies to both the loss and the acquisition of physical facilities as well as human resources. Significant information regarding the establishment of a new instructional program or the acquisition of specialized research equipment should be forwarded as soon as the facilities become effective. It is impossible to give any formula for determining what is significant information because the outside limits on the requirements have not been established, and there is little probability they will be established for some time. Detailed reports that are well organized and indexed for ready reference have proved to be the most effective.

In Conclusion

The representatives of many institutions have compiled and forwarded reports of their physical facilities and human resources with the full knowledge that there is little possibility of an occasion arising when their facilities would be considered for use in a national program. Nevertheless, they have given the time and effort necessary to prepare reports. These reports extend the usefulness of the inventory by increasing its representativeness. General recognition of this project as a cooperative one increases the confidence placed in it by other agencies and is an encouragement to those who are striving to make the project a success. If each participating institution will file supplemental reports when significant changes occur in any aspect of the institution's plant, program, or personnel, it will be possible for the Office of Education to furnish current information to other Government agencies in a prompt and efficient manner.

Defense Information Bulletin

A NEW *Defense Information Bulletin* has been issued on the allotment of critical materials for education construction in the first quarter of 1952. Most of the information is included in the first article of this number of HIGHER EDUCATION.

College Housing Loan Program

By GEORGE C. DECKER*

THE College Housing Loan Program—a program for the support of housing projects at colleges and universities—is now well under way. It offers substantial relief to those institutions that are prepared to secure its benefits. The Office of Education advises with the Housing and Home Finance Agency in the administration of the program.

Need for the Program

The College Housing Loan Program has been established in accordance with the provisions of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public, No. 475, 81st Cong.) approved by President Truman on April 20, 1950. The original bill to provide Federal funds for the support of housing projects carried no provision for housing projects at colleges and universities. Largely due to the urging of educators, title IV was added to the bill in order to meet the needs of higher education institutions.

Several reasons were stated for this provision. First, enrollments at the college level had almost doubled from 1940 to 1949. This sharp increase had followed a period of about 15 years during which housing construction at colleges and universities had been almost at a standstill, with the result that housing was grossly inadequate. The situation was further complicated by the fact that in the post-World War II period many facilities formerly at the disposal of colleges for student and faculty housing were no longer available. Students and faculty were outbid for low rental properties by defense workers who stayed in the employ of industries converted to peacetime production and later back to defense production. In many instances houses formerly used by students and faculty were replaced by higher-income housing or by nonresidential developments. Temporary buildings supplied by the Federal Government from war surplus materials were used as an expedient to meet the housing emergency. Even these resources were insufficient to meet the needs without great crowding. Soon the temporary structures began to deteriorate, and to impose undue costs for maintenance and operation. In terms of safety and architectural dignity they left much to be desired. The need for an extensive program to provide permanent housing at large numbers of colleges and universities was inescapably clear.

In the past, money for constructing dormitories has been secured chiefly from bequests made by philanthropically minded individuals, from direct appropriations or approval of bond issues by State legislatures, and from private loan sources. The time had come, however, when gratuities or endowments for constructing dormitories were decreasing and inadequate. The amounts available from State sources were also considered inadequate to meet current needs. Money obtainable in the open market was not generally available under conditions which were warrantable for nonprofit educational institutions. The usual amortization periods allowed under the provisions of private loans require unjustifiably high rentals. Moreover, the profit margin for low-cost housing is too low to attract private investors. Therefore, if sufficient, suitable, low-cost housing was to be provided, another means of financing the construction had to be developed.

Provisions for Securing a Loan

In order that housing for educational institutions might be provided as intended, the following provisions were incorporated into the conditions for obtaining a loan under title IV of the act: (1) Evidence must be supplied to show that the funds are not available from other sources upon comparable terms and conditions; (2) the Administrator of the loan fund must be satisfied that the proposed building is economical in design and in the building materials to be used; (3) loans are to be available only for construction begun since the effective date of the act, i.e., April 20, 1950; (4) the loan is not to exceed the total development cost and is to bear interest of one-quarter of 1 percent above the annual rate specified in the most recently issued Government bonds having a maturity of 10 years or more, but at present an interest rate of 2.75 is to be paid by the borrowing institution; and (5) the loan may be for any period but not to exceed 40 years.

On July 18, 1950, within 3 months of the passage of Public Law 475, and before application forms were made available, operations under title IV with respect to housing for educational institutions were

*Chief, College Housing Loan Program, Office of Education.

suspended because of the situation arising from the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. Military and defense requirements took priority for needed materials. The College Housing Loan Program therefore remained inactive until January 15, 1951. At that time, an executive order made available $40 million of the $300 million authorized by Congress,[1] with the added stipulation that the funds thus released were to be used for college or university housing which contributed to defense activities.

Administration of Loans

The administration of the College Housing Loan Program is vested in the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Subject to law and to the supervision of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Commissioner of Community Facilities administers the program of loans which are made under title IV of the Housing Act of 1950. The Community Facilities Service is an organizational unit within the office of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Under the provisions of the act, the Administrator was authorized to consult with and to secure the advice and recommendations of the Office of Education in the Federal Security Agency. Consequently the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency requested that the Office of Education provide assistance by making educational determinations with respect to applications for loans.

The educational determinations made by the Office of Education deal with pertinent background information regarding the respective institutions, eligibility of the institution in question as an institution of higher learning, and the need for housing. Subsequently, the Office of Education was also requested to make recommendations regarding the extent to which the proposed housing would contribute directly to the defense effort of the nation.

Before final approval of a loan request, it is necessary that five reviews of the application be made. Aside from the review by the Office of Education, there are reviews by the legal, the technical, and the fiscal divisions of the Community Facilities Service. A final review of the application in terms of all factors is made in the Office of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

[1] The Housing and Home Finance Administrator has been authorized by Congress to issue and to have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations, for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, in an amount not to exceed $300,000,000. The $300,000,000 thus provided for serves as the College Housing Loan Fund.

Demand for College Housing Loans

The importance of the legislation under which funds were initially approved to provide loans for the construction of housing for educational institutions was indicated by numerous responses immediately after passage of the Housing Act of 1950 and by the resumption of inquiries after reactivation of the program. Inquiries from more than 300 institutions have been received in the Office of Education relative to the College Housing Loan Program. Additional inquiries have been received by the Community Facilities Service and its divisional offices. Forty-two applications for college housing loans were received during the 7 months from April 1 to November 1, 1951.

The loans requested by the 42 colleges and universities which made application ranged from $80,000 to $4,097,000 per institution. The total amount involved for these institutions was $32,900,000. The schools for which loans have been requested are situated in 25 States and 1 Territory and are nearly equally divided among nonpublic and public institutions of higher education.

It is anticipated that a considerable number of additional applications for college housing loans will be received by the Housing and Home Finance Agency within the next few months. As these applications are received and approved, the $40 million available may prove insufficient to meet the needs for loans for defense-related projects. In that case the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may request the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase obligations for the additional amounts within the total of the $300 million authorized by the Eighty-first Congress for the College Housing Loan Program.

The College Housing Loan Program does not provide direct Federal subsidies for any educational institution. The program is administered strictly on a *loan* basis. Provisions to amortize loans over a period up to 40 years, together with a favorable rate of interest, give institutions an opportunity to liquidate debts largely from the proceeds of housing rentals. Thus it is possible for the institution to acquire needed housing with no burden to itself and with a reduced burden to the students and faculty members involved.

Problems To Be Met

At present all housing approved for loans under title IV of Public Law 475 must have a defense

relationship. Defense relationship has to be analyzed with specific reference to the individual situation. In general, housing which supplies the needs for students or faculty in terms of ROTC program requirements is considered to have the requisite defense relationship. The same may prove to be true with reference to housing required for research staff who are engaged in military or defense contracts. It may be that the institution engages in defense activities or programs, other than research or training contracts, which have a defense-related function. In some cases the institution's housing need has been made more acute by the impact upon student and faculty housing of military and industrial establishments in the vicinity of the college or university.

In any case, the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Office of Education can be expected to take into consideration only such defense factors as are presented and explained by the respective institutions. These representations are at all times subject to verification. The institution for which the housing is desired has the responsibility of making the best possible case for itself.

Important as the defense relationship proviso is at this time, it is nevertheless temporary; the College Housing Loan Program, however, is set up on a revolving fund basis and is designed to aid in meeting the long-range housing needs of educational institutions. Loans made should serve to facilitate the achievement of the ultimate housing plans of the institutions receiving them.

Currently the critical international situation requires a control of such materials as are needed for defense purposes. The Controlled Materials Plan, now administered by the National Production Authority, will undoubtedly have to operate for a considerable, though as yet indeterminate, period.

In the development of a dossier of housing needs and the plans to meet them, there are instances in which the officials of educational institutions find it desirable to consult with Office of Education personnel before submitting an application for a loan. Since the Office of Education is operating its aspects of the College Housing Loan Program with a skeleton staff located entirely in Washington, D. C., two possibilities are open: the one, that officials from the respective institutions either come to Washington for conferences or try to clarify all issues by correspondence; the other, that liaison be established sufficiently early so that a representative from the Office of Education may include several neighboring institutions in the itinerary of one field trip. It is not at all certain that all those who have the greatest need for loans have applied for them.

In Conclusion

An institution can well be advised to survey its needs for housing in order to draft a master plan and program for meeting its needs. Inasmuch as the allocation of controlled materials is involved, and inasmuch as there is a possibility that Federal funds might be secured on a loan basis, it would be to the advantage of the institution to have its long-term housing program on file with the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Office of Education. To make such a procedure possible, the Housing and Home Finance Agency has recently stated that colleges and universities may file preliminary applications through its regional offices, without going to the time and expense of preparing detailed legal and financial exhibits. In the event that the application is given preliminary approval on all points except the legal and financial exhibits, the college or university would complete all phases and resubmit for a full review.

Cooperative Bureau for Teachers

THE Cooperative Bureau for Teachers, 1776 Broadway, New York City, has announced the organization, on a permanent and professional basis, of a placement service for college teachers. Founded in 1924, the bureau has been concerned with placement of teachers and administrators and with research on problems involving personnel for elementary and secondary schools. In 1947 a placement service for college teachers was established on an experimental basis.

The bureau, a nonprofit member organization, is governed by a board of college and school administrators and teachers. Each member college receives as complete a placement service as the bureau can give. In addition to the member colleges, approximately 75 institutions list their vacancies.

The bureau will be helpful not only to faculty members seeking new positions, but also to students entering the field of college teaching. It will serve as a much-needed clearinghouse through which good teachers may find new opportunities, receive recommendations to posts for which they are well suited, and find help both in meeting crises in employment and in developing plans for further study.

The National Scientific Register

By JAMES C. O'BRIEN*

ABOUT 150,000 of the Nation's scientists—including physicists, chemists, chemical engineers, biological and agricultural scientists, geoscientists, mathematicians, statisticians, astronomers, and crystallographers—are cooperating in the Government's scientific personnel registration program.

Origin and Purpose of the Program

Preliminary study of the scientific manpower problem by the National Security Resources Board in 1947–48 clearly revealed that no precise information was available concerning the extent and character of America's scientific manpower resources, either in gross quantitative terms, or, more important, in qualitative terms; moreover no comprehensive studies were being undertaken to prepare a base for logical plans to meet the requirements of the Nation's expanded research programs or the inevitable increased demands for scientific manpower should the Nation be forced into war.

Between 1947, when the World War II National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel was inactivated, and 1950, when mobilization pressures were again building up to a high pitch, there was no adequate machinery for obtaining detailed information on this important segment of the Nation's manpower resources.

The National Scientific Register had its origin in the bills considered by the Congress in connection with the establishment of the National Science Foundation. Early in 1950 the National Security Resources Board, which had over-all responsibility to the President for manpower mobilization planning—realizing the urgency of the need for information and the importance of the time element—took affirmative action prior to the passage of the pending National Science Foundation legislation and established the National Scientific Register as an interim project until such time as the National Science Foundation could be organized and could assume operating responsibility for the function. The Register was organized under the supervision of a director assigned by the National Security Resources Board and administered under a contractual arrangement with the United States Office of Education.

The Office of Education was selected as the most appropriate agency to administer the project because of its relationship with institutions and agencies dealing with problems involving the training of scientists—the Nation's vital pipeline of supply. This action of the National Security Resources Board has resulted in the saving of at least a year of valuable time in the development of vitally needed information.

Mechanics of the Program

The National Scientific Register, operating within a framework of policy consistent with anticipated functions of the National Science Foundation as set forth in its organic act, has confined the area of its present registration to the natural and engineering sciences and mathematics. The registration program is conducted as a joint effort between the Register and organized science in America, represented by the principal professional and scientific societies and councils. Committees of experts, representing the sciences involved, collaborated in developing sound coding and classification structures for the various disciplines; and the data in the Register are classified and recorded by means of a mechanical punched-card system designed (1) to yield to various types of statistical analyses, and (2) to permit the identification of specific skills of individual scientists, or of groups of skills which might be required for planning or mobilization purposes.

A questionnaire combining the elements of simplicity of execution, completeness of data, and adaptability to mechanical processes was determined to be the most expedient method of securing information. A series of questionnaires is used, all eliciting the same biographical information, but each designed to obtain data regarding specializations within a specific discipline or group of related disciplines.

The Register has followed the principle of utilizing the services of existing agencies in arranging for the distribution, processing, and evaluation of the questionnaires wherever possible. Questionnaires have been distributed to individual scientists under contractual arrangements with the American Institute of Physics, the American Chemical So-

*Assistant Commissioner (Defense Activities) and Director, National Scientific Register.

ciety, and the National Research Council. Registration, however, is not restricted to scientists who have society affiliations, and efforts are being made to obtain the registration of scientists who are not members of societies. The scientific societies and councils have cooperated to the fullest extent not only in distributing questionnaires, but in publishing articles in technical journals and in taking other steps to elicit a high percentage of returns from individuals to whom registration documents have been sent. This arrangement, coupled with the genuine desire of scientists to cooperate with the Government during the current emergency, has resulted in a higher degree of response than would normally be expected in a survey of this type. For example, spot checks of several large colleges and universities throughout the country against registrations in the field of physics indicate a high percentage of response from physicists employed as full-time teachers, some showing 100-percent registration.

In a little over a year of operation, initial circularizations have been accomplished in the natural and physical sciences, with returns from approximately 150,000 scientists; coding and analysis of questionnaires in the fields of physics and chemistry have been completed; punched-card files in physics are ready for use; and plans have been made for the circularization of members of certain branches of engineering within the next fiscal year.

Research and Statistical Program

The consensus of informed individuals, both from governmental and private agencies concerned with the many phases of the scientific manpower problem, is that the Nation faces acute shortages of trained personnel in many fields, and that these shortages threaten the country's ability to carry out the defense program at a tempo necessary to insure national survival. The solution of this critical problem can lie only in a vigorous program for the training of new scientists and for full utilization of the existing supply. To be realistic and productive, the national program must be based on results of sound research in the areas of supply and requirements. There is no simple answer to the major problem of determining the exact status of either the supply of scientific manpower or national requirements for scientific skills. Although many agencies, both private and public, have made efforts to seek solutions to parts of the scientific manpower problem, there remain many areas in which information is fragmentary or nonexistent.

A comprehensive research program has been proposed by the Register to meet the requirements of planning agencies, both public and private, concerned with mobilization, training, the development of educational curriculums, policy regarding deferment from military service, the allocation of funds for scholarship and fellowship programs, and research. To meet the immediate need for information, the Register has projected a series of studies concerning the characteristics of each scientific and technological field, including such factors as (1) age and sex distribution, (2) educational levels, (3) reserve and military status, (4) employment status, (5) trends in employment, (6) fields of specialization, (7) comparison of fields of specialization with field of employment, (8) functions within the specialties performed by individual scientists, (9) kinds of specialists employed by the various types of employers, and (10) the geographical distribution of scientists. The operating plan of the Register provides that studies for each discipline will be completed independently so that reports will be available at the earliest possible time. A report of Register data relating to physicists is presently being prepared for publication. Tabulations of the statistical data regarding chemists and chemical engineers are in progress.

The current and projected research program of the Register includes, in addition to studies of the characteristics of individual scientific disciplines based on registration data, collateral studies designed to delineate more clearly specific segments of the scientific manpower picture, such as (1) studies of the total extent of the scientific population, based on cooperative sampling studies; (2) studies of scientific potential through both registration and sampling of student populations; and (3) studies relating to the development of personnel research techniques. Statistical analysis of data obtained in the various projects will be made on a cooperative basis with such organizations as the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the National Research Council, and publication of the findings will be through the Register's "Scientific Manpower Series." The first volume of this series, *Research and Development Personnel in Industrial Laboratories—1950*, was published in May 1951. The second report, concerned with a study of sanitary engineers, is scheduled for publication in November 1951.

In Conclusion

In the present mobilization period, the Register is rapidly becoming equipped to fill a critical need in the scientific manpower planning field for both immediate and long-range purposes by providing relatively complete information concerning America's supply of scientists and by serving as a bench mark against which current and projected demands for scientific personnel can be measured. Agencies and institutions concerned with mobilization planning, training, problems of higher education, and scholarship and research programs are already looking to the Register for assistance in formulating policy concerning the Nation's scientific manpower resources. The cooperation and support of individual scientists participating in registration is a major contributing factor to the success of the program.

Educational Exchanges

By PAUL E. SMITH*

"WRAP the idea up in a person and send it abroad" serves as a text for this explanation about the educational-exchange activities of the United States Government. Since the beginning of the United States Government's exchange of persons program in 1938, the Office of Education has been an ardent participant. The Department of State has over-all responsibility for the administration of the exchange of persons programs, authorized by several public laws.

Starting very modestly, the program of the exchange of persons has had a steady expansion during the past decade. In the present year nearly 10,000 persons are being exchanged with more than 60 countries for study, teaching, lecturing, and research under various programs of the Department of State. The Office of Education participates in this vital enterprise by administering and operating the following programs: The Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations; the travel and/or maintenance grants for Latin American graduate students; the Fulbright program for teachers who go to teach in the national elementary and secondary schools abroad; the interchange of teachers; the teacher-trainee program; specialized programs for Germany, Austria, Japan, and Ryukyus, and technical assistance in education in economically underdeveloped countries (point IV).

Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations

This treaty, popularly known as the Buenos Aires Convention, was signed in 1936, and provides for the annual exchange of two graduate students between each of the 17 signatory American Republics—Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the United States, and Venezuela. Students are nominated by their own governments, and the successful candidates receive grants for one year. Either the student or his government pays transportation costs, and the receiving government pays a limited maintenance allowance, tuition, and fees.

Latin American students apply for these awards through their Ministries of Education. United States students apply through the Office of Education. Qualifications for United States students include: United States citizenship, a bachelor's degree or its equivalent by the time the award is accepted, a satisfactory knowledge of the language of the country in which the study is to be undertaken, good health, and a suitable plan of study or research. All other considerations being equal, students under 35 years of age and those who are veterans are given preference. Factors, other than personal and academic qualifications, in the selection, are the opportunities and resources available in participating countries, the needs of those countries, and the requirements of the institution with which the applicant is to be associated.

Since 1940 more than 250 graduate students from Latin America have come to this country under the terms of the Buenos Aires Convention. Fields of study most frequently represented have been education, medicine, engineering, economics, public and business administration, natural science, and den-

*Director, International Educational Programs Branch, Office of Education.

tistry. Fewer United States students have participated in the program because it was suspended during World War II and not resumed until 1948.

Travel and Maintenance Program

The United States Government also makes a limited number of travel and/or maintenance grants to graduate students from the other American Republics for study in this country. Although similar to the fellowships offered under the Buenos Aires Convention, these grants are different in that they apply to all Latin-American countries.

Funds for this program are provided by the Department of State. The program is administered by the Institute of International Education under the supervision of the Office of Education. The grants supplement personal funds of the student, a tuition scholarship from a college or university, or a grant from some other source.

Fulbright Program for Teachers

The Fulbright Act, an amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944, authorizes the use for educational exchanges of certain foreign currencies and credits acquired through the sale of surplus property abroad. To date 22 countries—Australia, Austria, Belgium and Luxemburg, Burma, China (suspended), Egypt, France, Greece, India, Iran, Italy, Japan, Korea (suspended), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, and United Kingdom—have signed agreements with the United States to participate in such exchanges. Grants are awarded to Americans for study, teaching, lecturing, or research and are always paid in foreign currencies. Grants are also awarded to foreign nationals for the purpose of attending American-sponsored institutions in their home countries. Travel grants are also made to foreign nationals to come to the United States for study, research, and teaching. United States educational foundations or commissions, with binational boards of directors, are responsible for the administration of the program in the respective participating countries. The Board of Foreign Scholarships, appointed by the President, supervises the program and makes final selection of individuals and institutions qualified to participate.

To the United States elementary and secondary school teachers the Office of Education announces the opportunities for assignment in the national elementary and secondary schools abroad, receives applications, screens the candidates through interviewing committees, and presents to the Board of Foreign Scholarships panels of candidates for the designated openings overseas.[1] The Office also receives from the educational foundations abroad, through the Department of State, the applications of foreign teachers and places them in the schools of this country.

Interchange of Teachers

Another program provides for the interchange of teachers between this country and other nations. It is distinguished from previously mentioned efforts in two principal ways: (1) Its participants are matched and exchanged in pairs on a person-for-person basis; and (2) their primary function in the country to which they go is actual classroom teaching for one academic year.

For 15 years preceding the outbreak of World War II, a very successful, but limited, interchange of teachers between Great Britain and the United States was carried on through the English-Speaking Union. A total of 134 American and British teachers exchanged places during that period. During the 5 years immediately preceding the war there was growing interest in these exchanges and an increasing number were arranged.

At the close of World War II, the Foreign Office of the United Kingdom suggested to the United States Department of State that this interchange of teachers between the two countries be resumed. The operation of the United States' part of this program was assigned to the Office of Education with the guidance of an advisory committee composed of representatives of the major national educational organizations of this country. In the United Kingdom the program was administered by a similar committee. The interchange was officially resumed in September 1946 when 74 American and 74 British teachers exchanged places for the school year.

From the original interchange between the United States and Great Britain, the program has broadened to include Canada, France, Belgium, Luxemburg, Norway, the Netherlands, Austria, Italy, Australia, and New Zealand.

Table 1 shows the growth of the program.

[1] The American Council on Education recruits teachers for positions in the American schools abroad. The Institute of International Education is the agency to which graduate students apply for Fulbright grants, and the Conference Board of Associated Research Council receives applications from candidates for postdoctoral research and university lectureships.

Since 1949 travel grants under the Fulbright Exchange Program have been awarded to all of the teachers in this program except those exchanging between Canada and the United States. Under this program during the present year 63 United States teachers are teaching in 11 countries (see table 2), and 3 teachers from other countries are members of the faculties of American high schools.

Table 1.—Number of teachers exchanged between the United States and various countries, 1946–51

Country	Number of teachers						
	1946–47	1947–48	1948–49	1949–50	1950–51	1951–52	Total
Great Britain	74	126	112	97	102	102	613
Canada	----	4	7	16	7	11	45
France	----	----	7	7	11	7	32
Belgium	----	----	----	1	4	3	8
New Zealand	----	----	----	----	3	5	8
Norway	----	----	----	----	----	6	6
Netherlands	----	----	----	----	----	3	3
Austria	----	----	----	----	----	1	1
Australia	----	----	----	----	----	4	4
Grand total	74	130	126	121	127	142	720

Table 2.—Noninterchange assignments of American teachers under the Fulbright Program

Country	Number of teachers				
	1948–49	1949–50	1950–51	1951–52	Total
Burma	1	1	2	4	8
Belgium	----	2	----	----	2
Netherlands	----	1	9	20	30
India	----	----	3	6	9
Iran	----	----	5	4	9
Italy	----	1	1	5	7
Philippines	----	----	6	3	9
Turkey	----	----	1	1	2
Austria	----	----	----	3	3
Egypt	----	----	----	5	5
Pakistan	----	----	----	2	2
Thailand	----	----	----	9	9
Ceylon	----	----	----	1	1
Grand total	1	5	27	63	96

Teacher Trainees

In 1944 the Office of Education initiated a training program for teachers from the other American Republics. This program was designed to offer to experienced teachers the opportunity to observe practices in the field of their specialty and to participate in the work of the educational institutions of this country.

The visiting teachers usually come for 6 months, which they spend in the following manner: First, the visitor spends approximately 2 weeks in Washington where he is given a general orientation. The time is spent conferring with members of the Office of Education staff concerning the general organizational pattern of education in the United States. Then, through consultation with one supervising specialist in his field and with others in supporting fields, his needs are discussed and a program is worked out for him. Lectures, conferences, exhibits, and suitable reading materials are arranged for him. Appointments with personnel in related fields in other governmental and private agencies are made for the teacher.

The orientation period is followed by from 4 to 5 months of practical internship which is usually divided into two periods. These assignments involving observation, visitation, and consultation are made to different localities or sections of the United States in order that the visiting teachers may receive a broad educational experience and may bring to a larger number of teachers in this country a more intimate knowledge of the educational organization and problems of their countries. Areas where conditions are comparable to those in the teacher's own country are stressed in planning itineraries.

Trainees visit elementary and secondary schools, colleges and universities, State departments of education, educational broadcasting stations, and various special projects depending upon fields of interest.

At the conclusion of the fellowship, these teachers return to Washington for a 2-week summing-up period in which experiences are discussed with advisers and conclusions are reached on what might be done in the particular field of the trainee when he or she goes home. The trainee then prepares a comprehensive final report, outlining the results of his observations, commenting on points of particular importance, and concluding usually with specific suggestions for improvement or a program to be put into effect in his field in his home country.

During the first years of the teacher-trainee program, when numbers were small, the foregoing pattern was used. In the current academic year, when the numbers have increased markedly, the plans have been altered somewhat.

The most significant shift is that groups of teachers interested in similar fields or levels of instruction are sent to one center where a local coordinator directs the visitation, takes care of housing, and handles the details for that part of the trainee's stay. Following the experiences in this school community, the trainee is directed to another school situation in another section of the country for a period of observation and practice.

From 1944 to 1950 there were approximately 200 teacher-trainees who participated in this activity. During the current year about 200 teachers from 42 countries are practicing and observing in our schools.

Cooperation With International Organizations

The Office of Education has primary responsibility for planning the programs of United Nations fellows coming to the United States for training in various educational fields. Programs similar to those for teacher trainees are arranged for the visitors. The Office also cooperates with the Institute of International Education in advising and consulting with UNESCO fellows while they are in the Washington area.

Educational Leaders and Specialists

Another program which is operated by the Department of State under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, popularly known as the Smith-Mundt Act, is the exchange of leaders and specialists. When the foreign leaders in education come to this country the Office of Education is requested to arrange for interviews with appropriate specialists in their fields of interest. At the same time a program of visits to selected educational institutions is worked out for the visitor. During the present academic year approximately 100 leading educators from other countries will be directed to the Office for consultation and assistance.

Washington Orientation Center

The Office supervises the activities of the Washington Orientation Center and admits students and trainees holding official United States Government fellowships. Between 400 and 500 visitors have attended the Center annually. The Center provides English instruction and general orientation to American life and culture to these grantees before they begin their study or training.

Programs for Austria, Germany, Japan, and Ryukyus

Shortly after the close of World War II, the Department of the Army began a program which had for its purpose the orientation of the German and Austrian people toward a more democratic way of life. The Department of State assumed responsibility for the German program in 1949 and for the Austrian program in 1950, following the return of the two countries to civil administration. Under these programs large numbers of German and Austrian nationals, ranging from teen-age students to prominent leaders, are brought to the United States to study, observe, and experience the American way of life. Participants are selected by the Office of the United States High Commissioner for the respective countries. Smaller numbers of American specialists are sent to Germany and Austria to assist the people of those countries in the orientation process. The Austrian program is now being coordinated with the exchange program planned under the Fulbright agreement with that country. A similar program is underway in Japan and the Ryukyus, under the auspices of the Department of the Army, which has identical purposes and which is carried out on lines similar to those used in Austria and Germany. The Office of Education was asked to take responsibility for the programs for leaders and specialists in education from these areas.

Upon their arrival in Washington the visitors are given an orientation to American education. Then, following conferences with specialists in their fields, an itinerary is arranged for them to visit educational institutions in this country. The visitors remain in the United States for periods ranging from 2 to 9 months.

Table 3.—Number of participants in programs for Austria, Germany, Japan, and Ryukyus

Country	1949	1950	1951
Austria		11	13
Germany	98	105	341
Japan	30	47	114
Ryukyus		3	13

The Office was recently asked to assume responsibility for a training program for teachers from Germany. At present 189 of these are in the United States. The pattern which they will follow is similar to that described above under the teacher trainee program.

Technical Assistance in Education (Point IV)

Unlike many other programs of foreign aid, Point IV is one in which effective operation does not depend upon the allocation of money. It is a bold new program of technical assistance in which vision and common sense are significant elements. It is a campaign for the betterment of mankind.

The Office of Education has been assigned by the Department of State the operation of educational programs in certain economically underdeveloped countries. Technical assistance in education is made available in two ways: First, following a survey of educational needs in a given country or upon receipt of requests for assistance, the Office sends to the field educators who work with school officials of that country in improving educational facilities; second, trainees are invited to come to the United States for special work in their fields. These trainees follow a pattern similar to that described above.

Table 3 shows the number of participants in the program since the Office has been administering it.

During the current year about 1,000 visitors from other countries will come to the Office of Education on official programs. They will study, teach, and observe in our schools and colleges. They will learn to know American life and ways, and when they return to their classrooms in their own countries, they will be the spokesmen for the United States. Reports from visitors who have been here reveal that the experiences were rich not only academically and personally, but internationally.

Survey of the Architectural Profession

A PROGRESS REPORT by the chairman of its Commission for the Survey of Education and Registration has recently been published by the Department of Education and Research of the American Institute of Architects (AIA). It presents briefly in text and charts a selection of items from the factual data and tabulated opinions of architects collected by the Commission.

The Commission of 12 men contains representatives of practicing architects, registration boards, schools of architecture, the National Architectural Accrediting Board, and the Institute. Edwin S. Burdell, president of the Cooper Union, is chairman.

The AIA president in appointing the Commission in the fall of 1949 outlined five major questions for its consideration:

1. Is architectural education (now requiring 5 years in most schools) adequate, comprehensive, and coordinated as a professional education should be?
2. Does the architectural school, professing to train for a practice now as complicated as the medical, require sufficient educational background before technical disciplines are started? In other words, are architectural students mature enough when they enter professional study?
3. Is the period of internship sufficiently guided and supervised to insure the preregistrant the necessary enlargement of his experience to prepare him properly for the examinations; and further, might the examinations be taken in part at the time of graduation and in part at the termination of internship?
4. Are the examinations for license fair and proper? Has there been any tendency to restrict the number of practitioners?
5. Have we too many professional schools? And might there be two different kinds—one leading to professional degrees and standing; the other to enabling technicians to acquire proficiency and so aid in insuring them decent livelihoods?

Iranian and Pakistan Studies at Columbia

THIS FALL the Columbia University School of International Affairs inaugurated a Center of Iranian Studies and a Center of Pakistan Studies. Both centers are primarily concerned with present-day economic, social, and political problems of the two nations rather than with their historical development. Elementary and intermediate courses in the languages of the two nations are also available.

These new centers are the second and third units of the Near and Middle East Institute whose initial unit, the Israeli Center, was opened in September 1950. Plans for a fourth unit, a Center of Turkish Studies, are in progress. The School of International Affairs also has in operation institutes on Russia, East Asia, and Europe.

Critical Materials for Education Construction

A *Defense Information Bulletin* recently issued indicates congressional action on critical materials for education construction. The text follows.

Congressional Action

On Thursday, October 18, the Senate, by voice vote, passed Resolution No. 225 entitled "Resolution favoring increased allocations of steel, copper, and aluminum for construction of schools and hospitals." Senator Humphrey, with Senator Knowland and Senator Moody as cosponsors, introduced the resolution. Senator Saltonstall offered amendments which were accepted by Senator Humphrey. On the next day, the same resolution, with the exception of minor changes in wording, was introduced as House Resolution 474 by Representative Bailey and passed by unanimous consent of the House of Representatives.

The text of the House resolution is as follows:

"Whereas amounts of steel, copper, and aluminum have not been allocated in sufficient quantity or otherwise made available for the construction of educational and hospital facilities; and

"Whereas the education and health of the American people is vital to the strength of this Nation; and

"Whereas the education and health of the American people has a direct relationship to our military strength and economic productivity; and

"Whereas there is a demonstrated need for additional schools and hospitals, and for expansion of existing schools and hospitals; and

"Whereas an adequate and dependable supply of steel, aluminum, and copper are critical items in the programs to alleviate existing school and hospital inadequacies: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the National Production Authority and the Defense Production Administration should reconsider its allotments of steel, copper, and aluminum in such manner as to provide a greater quantity of such metals and products fabricated from such metals for the construction of and additions to schools and hospitals as may be required better to protect the educational and health standards of the people of the United States."

Subcommittee Hearings

During the course of the week of October 15 to 19 a special Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee on allotments of scarce materials for school construction, composed of Representative Cleveland M. Bailey, Chairman; Representative Thruston B. Morton; and Representative Boyd Tackett held hearings on the shortage of steel and other critical metals for school construction. Chairman Graham A. Barden of the House Education and Labor Committee had appointed a special subcommittee as early as February 5 to "investigate the possibility of having priorities granted on materials for school construction."

In opening the hearings Representative Bailey commented on the "nation-wide concern that in the all-out national defense effort now under way, the basic and essential needs of our schools are being neglected." During the course of the testimony approximately one-half of the members of the House of Representatives requested either an opportunity to file a statement or to appear before the subcommittee on behalf of the schools. Educators, school board representatives, architects, and others gave testimony to the critical nature of the school construction situation today.

At the conclusions of the hearings on Friday, the last witness, Manly Fleischmann, Administrator of the Defense Production Administration, promised Representative Bailey, Chairman of the Subcommittee, that he would immediately start a review of steel allocations for schools for the first quarter of 1952. Mr. Fleischmann stated that although he regarded the congressional request for more steel for schools to be in the nature of a "directive" he was unable to promise that he could provide more steel for schools without an opportunity to review all the other programs. This process, he indicated, would take at least 2 weeks.

A limited quantity of the printed transcripts of the hearings conducted by Representative Bailey should be available from that Committee in approximately 4 weeks. Requests should be addressed to Mr. Fred G. Hussey, Chief Clerk, Education and Labor Committee, House of Representatives, Room 429, House Office Building.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Government Publications

How To Obtain

(*1*) *Cost Publications: Send request, enclosing remittance (check or money order), to the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.*

(*2*) *Free Publications: Request direct from the agency issuing them.*

From the Office of Education

Education Directory 1950–51, Part 1, Federal Government and States. Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1951. 50 p. 15 cents.

How Children Learn About Human Rights, by Wilhelmina Hill and Helen K. Mackintosh. Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1951. Bulletin 1951, No. 9. 16 p. 15 cents.

How Children Learn To Think, by Paul E. Blackwood. Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1951. Bulletin 1951, No. 10. 19 p. 15 cents.

How Children Use Arithmetic, by Effie G. Bathurst. Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1951. Bulletin 1951, No. 7. 13 p. 15 cents.

Non-Government Publications

Higher Education in Virginia: Report of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia. Richmond, Va., Division of Purchase and Printing, Commonwealth of Virginia, 1951. 89 p. Proc.

Contains the report of the Council, the report of the consultant and appendixes of policy statements and data. The principal recommendation is that the State create a State board of higher education (1) to develop plans for a comprehensive unified Statewide program in higher education and (2) to coordinate the activities of the 10 State higher education institutions.

Lovejoy's College Guidance Digest—A monthly bulletin supplementary to *Lovejoy's College Guide*. New York 18 (Times Tower Building, Times Square, 1475 Broadway), N. Y., Clarence E. Lovejoy, 1951. Individual subscription, $10 a year.

Formerly "Supplementary Bulletin," now in its fourth year of publication; devoted to educational and vocational guidance involving colleges and universities; supplies up-to-date information about institutions.

Medical Education in the United States and Canada, 1950–51. 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago 10, Ill., Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, American Medical Association, 1951. 40 plus 63 p.

Part I—Fifty-First Annual Report on Medical Education in the United States and Canada by the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association, reprinted from the Educational Number of the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 147, p. 131–169 (Sept. 8, 1951); Part II—Proceedings of the Annual Congress on Medical Education and Licensure, Chicago, Ill., February 12–13, 1951.

Two Sides to a Teacher's Desk, by Max S. Marshall. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1951. 284 p. $3.

This book by a professor of bacteriology in the University of California (San Francisco) is "dedicated to students, teachers, and bystanders." The chapters deal with the goal in education, educational techniques and principles, evaluation, the student's place, and the administrator's side. The educational program is viewed in its relationship to a balanced whole community. Suggests that "perhaps after all we can find a good balance between teaching as a cooperative endeavor and teaching as a form of caretaking and discipline, a balance in which neither the practical and moral significance of discipline nor the necessity for dealing with students as persons is ignored."

HIGHER EDUCATION

Published semimonthly from September through May, by the Office of Education. Its printing was approved by the Bureau of the Budget on Nov. 2, 1949, as required by Rule 42 of the Joint Committee on Printing. Prepared in the Division of Higher Education.

MANAGING COMMITTEE

Lloyd E. Blauch, Chairman

Henry H. Armsby	**Robert Iffert**
W. Earl Armstrong	**Fred J. Kelly**
Willard W. Blaesser	**Jennings B. Sanders**
Claude E. Hawley	**Bernard B. Watson**
Ernest V. Hollis	**William R. Wood**

Publication Office: Office of Education
FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

Subscription: In advance, $1 a year (10 cents a single copy), to foreign countries, $1.50. For orders of 100 copies or more in bulk to one address within the United States, 25 percent discount is allowed. Orders with remittance should be sent to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

OSCAR R. EWING—Federal Security Administrator
EARL JAMES McGRATH, Commissioner of Education
JOHN DALE RUSSELL, Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1951